Appl. No. 09/697,545 Amdt. dated Sep. 4, 2003 Reply to Office action of Jul. 15, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

35 USC § 112

Claims 55-58, 60-68, and 70-74 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as lacking enabling support. The Applicant agrees in some respect (literal support) and disagrees in others (replacement of alkenyl with alkyl should be within a person of ordinary skill in the art). Nevertheless, the **applicant deleted the objected radicals** to advance prosecution, as the present

rejection was the only remaining rejection in this matter.

The applicant believes that the present claim amendments are sufficient to overcome the Examiner's concerns and believes that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this

case.

Respectfully submitted,

RUTAN & TUCKER

Attorneys for Applicant(s) P.O. Box 1950

Costa Mesa, CA 92628-1950

Tel.: (714) 641-5100 Fax: (714) 546-9035 Customer No. 34284 Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 46,697